

### Remark

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended. No claims were amended or cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-15 are now presented for examination.

### 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection

#### Chase-Salerno et al.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over US Patent No. 6,253,209 of Chase-Salerno, et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Chase-Salerno”).

As understood by the Applicants, Chase-Salerno, requires having an administrator at the “control workstation [for] provid[ing] a single point of control wherein the control workstation provides . . . interfaces to create, delete or update . . . [and] centrally administers the mirroring, unmirroring and bootless commands to nodes” (col. 6, lines 29-34). In Chase-Salerno, a “central workstation” or “central administration” is used to administer nodes and changes made to the nodes (col. 3, lines 30-32; col. 1, lines 6-10 and 28-30; col. 6, lines 29-34). In other words, Chase-Salerno requires having an administrator using a central workstation to *manage* any changes that are made *directly* on a node rather than making changes to a node’s volume group by changing a volume on the central workstation (see col. 6, line 29-34; col. 3, lines 6-8; col. 1; lines 28-32; see also Abstract).

In the last Office Action, mailed Oct. 22, 2002, the Examiner uses the word

“administrating” synonymously with “causing” (page 2). However, as referred to in Chase-Salerno, Applicants respectfully submit that the word “administrating” relates to “provid[ing] *a single point of control*” with regard to *managing* the nodes (col. 6, line 30; see col. 3, lines 6-8; col. 1; lines 28-32; see also Abstract; emphasis provided).

Furthermore, the Examiner takes Official Notice of automatically installing the appropriate edition software on a client computer (see page 3, Office Action, mailed Oct. 22, 2002). Applicants respectfully challenge the Official Notice and request the Examiner to provide specific evidence and explanation with regard to the Official Notice.

In contrast, claim 1 recites, in pertinent part, “a network computer (NC) client causing a plurality of NC clients that are booted to receive operating system software that is configured differently than that currently in effect by replacing one or more system volumes on the NC server containing the operating system software with one or more different system volumes.” As recited by claim 1, a client causes the plurality of clients that are booted to receive operating system software that is configured differently than that currently in effect. Moreover, one or more system volumes on the NC server are replaced with different system volumes. Chase-Salerno does not specifically teach or reasonably suggest replacing system volumes on a server with different system volumes or a client causing other clients to receive operating system software different than that currently in effect. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants submit that claim 1 is not obvious over Chase-Salerno and is allowable over the reference of record. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims.

With regard to claims 2-3 and 11-15, they contain limitations similar to those of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of independent claims 2-3 and 11-15 and their dependent claims.

### **Conclusion**

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome by the amendment and remark, and that the claims as amended are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn and the claims as amended be allowed.

### **Invitation for a Telephone Interview**

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.


### **Request for an Extension of Time**

Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: Dec. 20, 2002



Aslam A. Jaffery  
Reg. No. 51,841

Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP  
12400 Wilshire Boulevard, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026  
(303) 740-1980

**AMENDMENTS IN A MARKED VERSION**

**In the Claims:**

Claims 1 – 15 remain unchanged.